DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 631 AC 012 610

TITLE	Message from the President of the United States Transmitting the Fourth Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education. Higher Education Act.
INSTITUTION	Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.; National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education.
REPORT NO	House-Doc-91-407
PUB DATE	16 Nov 70
NOTE	44p.; 91st Congress, 2d Session
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Education; Advisory Committees; Annual Reports; *Community Service Programs; Educational Finance; *Extension Education; Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Higher Education

ABSTRACT

The report and recommendations of the President's National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education are provided in this Fourth Annual Report. The five recommendations of the Council are: (1) that Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 be reinstated as a line item in the President's budget for FY 1971 at a minimum level of $9.5 million; (2) that the past experience of Title I be reviewed to determine which programs have shown the greatest return for human and financial resources devoted to them to the end that these programs may be expanded and replicated in other communities or states; (3) that the authorization of Title I, HEA be extended for five years beyond its expiration at the end of FY 1971; (4) that the Secretary of HEW, in accordance with provisions of the law, provide the Council with such technical, secretarial, clerical and other assistance required to carry out its assigned functions; and (5) that the national needs for continuing education be reflected in the composition of commissions appointed by the President, the Secretary of HEW, or the Commissioner of Education to study general or particular aspects of the country's educational system. The two appendixes discuss the Community Service and Continuing Education Programs. (DB)

ED 062 631

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: AC HE
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

91st Congress, 2d S... Document No. 91–407

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

MESSAGE

FROM

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

THE FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

NOVEMBER 16, 1970.—Message and accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
48-011 O WASHINGTON : 1970

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith transmit the Fourth Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education.

This Council, established under Public Law 89–329, is required to report annually on the administration and effectiveness of the Community Service and Continuing Education Programs under Title I of the Higher Education Act and of all federally supported extension and continuing education programs.

Although the Council's report expresses its concern over the fact that the Administration did not request any funds for the Title I program in its fiscal year 1971 budget submission, I believe it should be made clear that there is no dispute about the purpose of the program. This Administration shares the objective of solving community problems by employing the resources of our institutions of higher education.

However, there is a question as to whether the Title I program, as presently constituted, provides the most effective vehicle for achieving this purpose.

This Administration is committed to curbing the proliferation of Federal grant programs. Only through such actions can we assure that the citizens of this country actually receive the benefits promised—but too often not delivered—by our present array of Federal programs of financial assistance.

In my March 19 Message on Higher Education, I proposed to apply this principle to community services and university extension programs. I noted that "the time has come for the Federal Government to help academic communities to pursue excellence and reform in fields of their own choosing . . . and by means of their own choice."

Accordingly, I proposed that Congress establish a National Foundation for Higher Education. This Federal agency would provide funds for institutions of higher education to assist them in encouraging reform and innovation, and thereby aid them in responding more effectively to their internal and external missions.

My legislative proposal would give the Foundation authority for support of activities to achieve the purposes of the present Title I program. I believe the Foundation offers a new, creative and more promising means of developing effective programs to solve community problems than does the existing Title I program.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 16, 1970.*

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION

AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

March 31, 1970

The President
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President:

On behalf of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, as authorized by Public Law 89-329, I am privileged as Chairman to submit to you the Fourth Annual Report of the Council.

The Council was created by Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to advise the Commissioner of Education on program administration and to review the administration and effectiveness of all federally supported extension and continuing education programs.

The report contains five recommendations which the Council finds deserving of immediate attention.

Faithfully yours,

James E. Allen, Jr.
Assistant Secretary for Education
and
U.S. Commissioner of Education

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

March 31, 1970

Honorable Robert H. Finch
Secretary of Health, Education
and Welfare
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

On behalf of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, as authorized by Public Law 89-329, I am privileged as Chairman to submit to you the Fourth Annual Report of the Council.

The Council was created by Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to advise the Commissioner of Education on program administration and to review the administration and effectiveness of all federally supported extension and continuing education programs.

This report reviews the Community Service and Continuing Education Program since its inception. The report also contains five recommendations which the Council believes are deserving of immediate attention.

Sincerely,

James E. Allen, Jr.
Assistant Secretary for Education
and
U.S. Commissioner of Education

THE PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

James E. Allen, Jr., Assistant Secretary of HEW and Commissioner of Education
Chairman

Honorable Joseph Alioto
Mayor of San Francisco
San Francisco, California

Rev. William P. Haas
President
Providence College
Providence, Rhode Island

Dr. Cyril O. Houle
Professor of Education
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Dr. John Hove
Chairman, Department of English
North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota

Mr. Jesse C. Kellam
Member Board of Regents
Texas State Senior Colleges
Austin, Texas

Dr. Edward L. Keller
Vice President Emeritus
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

Mr. Francisco D. Sanchez, Jr.
Coordinator, Office of New Programs
Albuquerque Public Schools
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Dr. Thurman J. White
Vice President for Special Projects
The University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

One representative each from the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Labor, Interior, State, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, and Transportation, as well as of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Small Business Administration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND OVERRIDING CONCERNS 1

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COUNCIL 2

APPENDIX I, SECTION A - COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS: FY 1969 5

1. General Developments 6
2. Participating Colleges and Universities 7
3. The People Served 7
4. Financing the Program 7
5. Focus on Urban and Suburban Areas 8
6. Community Problems and Exemplary Programs 8

a. Environmental-Ecological Programs 9
b. Title I Efforts in the Model Cities Areas 9
c. Educational Assistance to Minorities in Small Business Enterprises 10
d. Inner-City Education Programs 10
e. Improving Health and Attacking Hunger 10
f. Strengthening Local Government 11
g. Dealing with the Problems of Land Use, Transportation, and Housing 11
h. Improving Employment and Employability 11
i. Other Community Problems 12

7. Conclusion 12

APPENDIX I, SECTION B - OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM: 1966-1970 13

1. Accomplishments at the Institutional Level 15

a. New Structures and Procedures 16
b. Student Services in the Community 17
c. New Courses and Improved Instruction 17
d. New Institutional Commitments 17
e. Inter-Institutional Cooperation 18

2. Accomplishments at the State Level 18

a. Improved State Leadership and Responsibility 18
b. Contributions to Statewide Planning and Coordination 19
c. Stimulation of State and Local Financial Support 20

3. Accomplishments at the Community Level 20
4. Summary 21
5. Tables 22

APPENDIX II

1. A Review of Federally-Supported Extension and Continuing Education 29
2. Overview 30
3. Higher Education Programs 31
4. Conclusions 32
5. Tables 33

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OF THE

PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

ON

EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT

SUBMITTED MARCH 31, 1970

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

Introduction and Overriding Concerns

The Public Law which created this Council gave it several important responsibilities; among them are two major tasks. One task is to review the administration and effectiveness of community service and continuing education programs under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and report annually the findings and recommendations which grow out of this review to the Secretary of HEW and the President. The other task is that of discharging the same responsibilities with reference to "all federally supported extension and continuing education programs, including community service programs." Appendix I reflects the results of the Council's activities in performing the first task; Appendix II relates to the second task.

The Council is alarmed and deeply concerned about two facts that bring both of its tasks into serious jeopardy:

1. A decision was made recently by the Executive branch of government to recommend no funds in FY 1971 for Title I, HEA. Apparently this decision was an arbitrary one made without the benefit of the rigorous evaluation of the program which the President himself directed the Education Subcommittee of the Urban Affairs Council to perform. Furthermore, the decision was made without the awareness or advice of this Council, the administrators of the program at State and Federal levels, the institutions of higher education involved, and the communities being served. The Council finds it difficult to understand and reconcile this budgetary action with the note of the Senate Committee on Appropriations that "these programs have been especially productive, for both campus communities and local citizens, and the committee would hope this program will be expanded in the future."

2. Contrary to Sec. 109(e) of P.L. 89-329, the Secretary has never engaged the technical, secretarial, clerical, and other assistance required by the Council to carry out its functions. Failure on the part of successive Secretaries since 1965 to provide such assistance has hampered the work of the Council, particularly in reviewing programs throughout the Federal Government.

In spite of the crisis of support for Title I and the difficulties encountered by the Council in performing its functions without staff assistance, this report is submitted with the hope that the recommendations made will be useful to the Administration and the Congress in the formulation of their future plans for strengthening the role of higher education in community problem-solving.

48-011 O - 70 (H Doc 407) - 2

Recommendations of the Council

In view of the foregoing concerns and realities, the Council recommends:

1. THAT TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 BE REINSTATED AS A LINE ITEM IN THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET FOR FY 1971 AT A MINIMUM LEVEL OF $9.5 MILLION.

At least $9.5 million is needed for maintaining the present level of activity. Based upon identified needs, however, an additional $40 million is needed if a decision is made to retain Title I in its present form. The critical fact is that the Nation has now developed an educational expertise in Title I State Agencies, Advisory Councils, institutions of higher education and local communities. These individuals and groups are responding and are ready to respond even more massively than at present to the challenge of continuing education and community service if realistic levels of financial support are forthcoming. With small pilot projects and cautious planning during four years of modest funding, a reliable mechanism for improving community service and continuing education has been established that will disappear unless action is taken to reinstate Title I, HEA in the FY 1971 budget. Furthermore, an investment of approximately $15,000,000.00 annually of Federal and matching funds in the creation and refinement of a workable mechanism for establishing college-community partnerships in problem-solving will be lost.

2. THAT THE PAST EXPERIENCE OF TITLE I BE REVIEWED TO DETERMINE WHICH PROGRAMS HAVE SHOWN THE GREATEST RETURN FOR THE HUMAN AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES DEVOTED TO THEM TO THE END THAT THESE PROGRAMS MAY BE EXPANDED AND REPLICATED IN OTHER COMMUNITIES OR STATES.

Appendix I illustrates various aspects of the program by the use of examples. These have emerged as being significant or unusual in the minds of the State or Federal administrators of the program. They indicate that the early hopes and promises of the legislation are being met; the creative ideas of citizen leaders and college and university faculty members are being shaped in significant ways to deal with community problems. The 54 States and territories and the 727 institutions which have been involved in this program have provided a broad and realistic testing-ground. Now it is time for greater stress to be placed on the high-lighting of success and its emulation elsewhere.

This process can be forwarded in many ways. The State and Federal administrators can be asked to address themselves

to the question and to put it on the agenda of their advisory councils and committees. Independent appraisals can be commissioned of projects nominated as being excellent by staff members or advisory council members. National and regional conferences can be devoted to the description and analysis of successful innovative programs. By these means, and by other formal and informal methods, outstanding programs and formats can be high-lighted. In due course, State and Federal guidelines can be altered so that they reinforce and extend those endeavors which have proved their outstanding excellence.

3. THAT THE AUTHORIZATION OF TITLE I, HEA BE EXTENDED FOR FIVE YEARS BEYOND ITS EXPIRATION AT THE END OF FY 1971.

Four years of activity have provided convincing evidence that the program is worthy of continuation and increased support. Title I, HEA is serving successfully as a vehicle for bringing higher educational resources to bear upon the larger process of solving community problems, thereby making colleges and universities more responsive and relevant than before to the critical issues facing American society. It is the only Federal program that is geared to this critical task. To discard it now when nothing comparable exists in law or legislative proposal, is tantamount to saying that higher education in America should perform an insular and static role with respect to the real needs and interests of a dynamic society.

4. THAT THE SECRETARY OF HEW, IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROVISIONS OF THE LAW, PROVIDE THE COUNCIL WITH SUCH TECHNICAL, SECRETARIAL, CLERICAL AND OTHER ASSISTANCE REQUIRED TO CARRY OUT ITS ASSIGNED FUNCTIONS. THE STAFF IS NEEDED FOR THE FULFILLMENT OF THE COUNCIL'S TWO FUNCTIONS, BUT IS ESSENTIAL IN ACHIEVING THE SECOND ONE.

The significance and magnitude of the assigned tasks are especially well illustrated by Appendix II, based upon an analysis and summary of 241 Federal Government programs in continuing education for adults. Federal efforts in this area are directed by a vast array of agencies for a wide range of purposes. Overlap in purpose, procedures and resources is apparent in the areas of health resources, employability and education resource development. Twenty Federal programs of continuing education require submission of State plans and these should be studied to determine where Federal collaboration with State administration might be made more effective. Further study is required if meaningful consolidation and coordination is to be achieved

at Federal and State levels. The Council would like to serve the President more effectively than at present in the interests of eliminating duplication and aiding coordination, but cannot do so without staff support and assistance. If the Administration does not provide such support by June 30, 1970, the legislation should be amended to relieve the Council of its second function.

5. THAT THE NATIONAL NEEDS FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION BE REFLECTED IN THE COMPOSITION OF COMMISSIONS APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT, THE SECRETARY OF HEW, OR THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION TO STUDY GENERAL OR PARTICULAR ASPECTS OF THE COUNTRY"S EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.

Continuing education is an integral and growing part of the educational system. Any recommendation for change in the educational system will affect the continuing education function either by the requirement of new programs in continuing education or by the realignment of continuing education priorities.

Education for adults is a function shared by numerous social institutions including the schools, colleges, and universities. Nonetheless, few major national commissions have included members with concern for and expertise in the inescapable responsibility of public and private sectors to address the educational needs and interests of adult citizens.

Summary

The Council reaffirms its readiness to assist in the task of achieving National objectives with respect to higher education and community service. New goals and new programs will emerge in the future and we hope that we may be of service in planning and implementing them.

APPENDIX I

SECTION A - COMMUNITY SERVICE AND

CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS: FY 1969

APPENDIX I

COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS UNDER TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Section A - Community Service and Continuing Education Programs: FY 1969

1. General Developments

Fiscal Year 1969 saw significant developments taking place in the States as administrators took a stronger leadership role in program development and operation. The State leaders continued to move from a project grantsmanship approach to more comprehensive programs that aimed at developing long range institutional commitment and at maximizing program impact on both higher education institutions and the communities they serve.

In funding but 653 projects (as contrasted with 721 last year) the States took an important step toward developing higher impact activities. Decisions were difficult since State Administrators and Advisory Councils were faced with $40 million in project proposals and $9.5 million in Federal funds.

Major advances were made this year in support for projects that represent comprehensive, coordinated efforts for assisting in the solution of community problems and strengthening, in the process, the teaching, research and public service functions of higher education in America.

Colleges and universities continued to explore new ways of relating to their communities. Among the more important projects in this regard were the Urban Observatory Programs in ten pilot cities, the Community Governance Project in Washington, D.C. and the urban programs at Cleveland State, University of Buffalo, University of California, and Rutgers University. These efforts were generally institutional in nature, involving either an entire institution or a large segment of it in inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary approaches to helping communities solve problems. There were also cooperative or inter-institutional efforts involving both faculty members and students from consortia of colleges and universities. All of these projects were intended to benefit the communities and to strengthen the ability of participating colleges and universities to serve them.

The Urban Observatory Project, initiated in 1968, became operational in ten pilot cities across the Nation. The ten experiments are aimed at providing mechanisms for harnessing and applying the research, technical and intellectual resources of higher education to the problems of city governments. This significant development is the product of cooperative efforts among Federal Government agencies (HUD and HEW-USOE), ten State Agencies, ten city or metropolitan governments, more than thirty institutions of higher education, and the private sectors in the communities.

The ten cities in the program are: Albuquerque, New Mexico; Atlanta, Georgia; Baltimore, Maryland; Boston, Massachusetts; Cleveland, Ohio; Denver, Colorado; the Kansas City Metropolitan Area (Kansas City, Kansas and Kansas City, Missouri); Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Nashville, Tenn.; and San Diego, California. Although the programs are just beginning, the mayor of Nashville has expressed enthusiam for the program in his city where more than 125 professors from six institutions of higher education have established direct working and consulting relationships with scores of city officials and community leaders.

2. Participating Colleges and Universities

A total of 454 institutions of higher education participated in the development and operation of projects funded during FY 1969, a slight increase by seven institutions over FY 1968 (447) and 160 more than participated in the first year of the program.

As in the past, tax-supported colleges and universities received the major share of Federal funds (77.7%) and administered the largest number of programs (504). Two-year colleges received 9.2% of Federal funds in FY 1969 as compared to 6.7% in FY 1968.

Tables I and II show the number of institutions and the distribution of Federal funds by type of institution for Fiscal Years 1966 through 1969.

3. The People Served

The States reported that 800,000 people were direct recipients of educational services and an estimated 455,000 were reached indirectly by television and radio.

Men and women of all ages from all walks of life have participated in continuing education programs supported by Title I funds. County and city government employees, for example, have been enabled to improve their skills for improved public services. Poor blacks in West Greenville, North Carolina and in Milwaukee have used their abilities and talents in special programs. Hospital administrators, physicians and volunteers have learned how to work with "model cities" agencies in community improvement. Sheriffs and citizens together have determined new policies for local law enforcement.

4. Financing the Program

The Nation's 454 participating institutions of higher education sought ways to strengthen their community service efforts by conducting 653 Title I-supported projects. To finance the 653 projects the institutions, States and local communities provided $6.8 million to match $9.5 million in Federal allotments. State, institutional, and local contributions exceeded the matching requirement by $2 million. Federal allotments by State for Fiscal Year 1969 are shown in Table VII.

5. Focus on Urban and Suburban Areas

Title I programming in 1969 remained faithful to the mandate of the enabling legislation to give special emphasis to urban and suburban problems. A total of 364 projects (56%) were conducted in urban areas. Fifty others (7%) were conducted in suburban areas and 181 (28%) operated on a regional or statewide basis. Those in the latter categories were frequently related to urban problems such as poverty, human relations, minority business enterprise, leadership, youth opportunities, housing, land use, government services, and the area of environmental problems.

Rural oriented projects numbered 58 (9%) in FY 1969, one fewer than the number funded in FY 1968. These programs aimed, generally, at economic, governmental, and cultural development of the rural areas. For example, Appalachian State University in North Carolina initiated one program to provide continuing educational assistance to small business enterprises in isolated areas and started a pilot project for raising the quality of governmental services in rural communities. Tennessee Technological University, through counselling, technical assistance, and classes, instructed rural residents in seven Appalachian counties about sanitary conditions and health practices. Similar projects were conducted by Morehead State University in Kentucky and West Virginia University.

Regional or statewide projects included a series of seminars sponsored by Iowa State University in each of twelve regions of Iowa, focusing on health needs and services for persons of all ages but with emphasis on infants and the elderly. Regional workshops and information dissemination activities for school board members and administrators were developed by the University of Arkansas to improve the quality of public education.

Tables III and IV indicate the number of projects and distributions of Federal funds in terms of geographic area served during Fiscal Years 1966 through 1969.

6. Community Problems and Exemplary Programs

The Legislation suggested nine problem areas to which higher education resources might be addressed: housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use. To this list, the States and USOE added four other areas of concern: community development, personal development, human relations, and economic development. Tables V and VI show the number of programs and dollars spent in these problem areas during Fiscal Years 1966 through 1969. Within these broad problem areas urban education and hunger and malnutrition in the cities and rural areas received attention in 1969, as did concerns with environment,

Model Cities and minority business enterprise. Frequently these programs involved inter-Federal agency and State and local government cooperation. Some of the more important areas of concern in 1969 programming were:

a. Environmental-Ecological Programs

The Community Service and Continuing Education Program under Title I, HEA is one of the few Federal programs making a substantial educational effort in this area. A total of 96 institutional projects ($1,251,894 Federal and $925,683 in local matching) were directed at this problem in FY 1969. This represents over 12% of the total Federal project dollars available in 1969. Programs ranged from regional and State pollution control assistance (as in New Mexico, Texas, and Virginia) to neighborhood and community land use concerns (in Arizona, Florida, Maine, Minnesota, and Oregon). Also of significant note were programs dealing with environmental design and preservation of scenic values (as in Nebraska, Missouri, Colorado, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin). In Massachusetts, Williams College, Berkshire Community College and North Adams State College combined their resources to establish "The Center for Environmental Studies." Their main emphasis was directed toward developing citizen support and strengthening local governmental programs for improving environmental quality.

b. Title I Efforts in the Model Cities Areas

Inter-agency cooperation is illustrated by continuing efforts, through Title I, to focus the resources of higher education on Model Cities areas identified by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In such cases, the efforts of HUD are not duplicated but enhanced by these cooperative arrangements and the particular contribution made by Title I of educational services to the leaders and residents of the Model Cities areas.

Thirty-five Title I projects were conducted in 38 Model Cities during 1969. These programs were awarded $598,777 in Federal funds. This amount more than doubled Fiscal Year 1968 efforts. Programs varied in subject matter from educational programs relating to crime prevention and school drop-outs to job-related training activities, both on and off campus. In Texas and Oklahoma, participating colleges and universities provided technical assistance to all

Model Cities areas. University personnel in the program were especially valuable in helping Model Cities staff in planning and preparing program plans and proposals.

c. Educational Assistance to Minorities in Small Business Enterprises

Title I was responsible for activating seven educational programs designed either to assist minority entrepreneurs already in business or to prepare minority group members to enter new business enterprises. A total of $261,647 in Federal and local funds was allotted to these projects. Colleges and universities, in cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies, created innovative and developmental programs to assist small businesses. For example, Middlesex Community College in Connecticut is conducting a seminar, primarily for blacks, in elementary procedures and techniques involved in establishing and operating a small business. In the District of Columbia, Georgetown University and Howard University, instituted a joint program to improve the managerial skills of the inner-city black small businessman. Both universities work closely in this project with the Small Business Administration, the Foundation for Capitol Involvement, and the National Business League. Similar programs were activated in Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, and Washington State.

d. Inner-City Education Programs

There were sixteen programs related to urban public education in seven States in FY 1969. Such projects included an Institute in Black History and Culture conducted by Connecticut College for 50 elementary school teachers; inservice training programs for school board members in Arkansas, Maine, and Tennessee; and a program in drug abuse education by the University of Connecticut for selected high school science teachers.

e. Improving Health and Attacking Hunger

In FY 1969, 28 States initiated 54 projects related in some way to the improvement of community and personal health standards. Among the educational programs were those in nutrition, mental retardation, alcoholism, and drug addiction.

A University of Alaska "Native Nutrition" program was aimed at native Alaskans who migrate from remote villages to urban centers and must adjust to new food acquisition habits. Tuskegee Institute in Alabama provided technical information for food service workers in order to improve food service and nutrition in hospitals, nursing homes and extended care facilities. Other projects included a training program by the University of Rhode Island in basic health needs of mentally retarded children, their parents and day care workers from deprived areas.

f. Strengthening Local Government

A major factor in the solution of community problems is the strengthening of local and State government institutions and services. Forty States established as a priority the improvement of government operations through educational assistance.

Institutions conducted 152 educational projects in this area utilizing about 21% of the States' total program allocations. Texas, for example, concentrated its efforts on "Urban Local Governmental Affairs" and programmed 17 of its 26 institutional projects toward improvement of government operations. In Massachusetts, ten of the eleven institutional projects were directed at the improvement of local government.

g. Dealing with the Problems of Land Use, Transportation, and Housing

Educational projects were developed by the States to deal with the physical environment as it relates to transportation and housing problems. In Tennessee, for example, a Strip Highway Pilot Project attacked problems of design, traffic flow, and beautification. Lincoln University in Pennsylvania developed and conducted an Institute for Community Affairs in which housing plans for the community were formulated.

h. Improving Employment and Employability

Twenty-two cooperative programs were initiated to assist those who train the unemployed and underemployed to become economically self-sufficient. In the Los Angeles Junior College District, City College and the Trade-Technical College combined resources to provide a mobile occupational counselling service to ghetto and barrio residents.

i. Other Community Problems

The central objective of forty projects was the improvement of youth opportunities; 33 projects were directed to individuals in the poverty population; forty-two projects sought to improve human relations and communication between black and white, rich and poor, and young and old; while 33 projects focused on improved community recreation facilities and services. Educational programs designed to foster and enrich the personal development of individuals numbered 58.

7. Conclusion

In summary, the Community Service and Continuing Education Program under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 made significant strides in Fiscal Year 1969 despite recognized restraints and difficult problems. Major problems were identified and are beginning to yield to measures that were taken to increase the impact of the program on community problems and the community service dimension of higher education. Experience has shown that higher education opportunities for community service, properly supported and strengthened, are important keys to improving the quality of life in America.

The foregoing use of numerous examples to illustrate activity during Fiscal Year 1969 is somewhat impressive, but it fails to demonstrate that these modest attempts to focus the resources of higher education upon community problem-solving have enabled program administrators to discover promising models for creating productive partnerships between communities and institutions of higher education.

The following Section of this Appendix serves to highlight some of these emerging models and to focus attention on accomplishments of the program since its inception in 1966 at institutional, State, and community levels.

APPENDIX I

SECTION B - OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM: 1966-1970

APPENDIX I

COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

UNDER

TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Section B - Overview of the Program: 1966-1970

Four years of experience with Community Service and Continuing Education Programs under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 has provided remarkable evidence of the value and viability of the enabling legislation. The Act required the creation of new National, State, and local programming mechanisms, the development and strengthening of State and National administrations, and the provision of a pervasive and persuasive focus for the program. In spite of meagre congressional appropriations, Title I, HEA has emerged as a highly effective demonstration of Federal-State teamwork in strengthening the community service dimensions of higher education, and in providing problem-solving assistance to American communities.

Colleges and universities have learned to program more effectively their resources in providing problem-solving assistance to cities, towns and rural areas. The discrete short-term projects that characterized efforts in the early days of the program are being replaced by more comprehensive programs that aim at the dual task of providing needed community education and strengthening the capacity of institutions of higher education to carry on continuing education and community service programs.

Comprehensive planning is underway for long-range and sustained involvement of colleges and universities with their communities. Increased participation of students and faculty, the testing of new arrangements for educational services and the trend toward fewer projects with long-range impact are major achievements of the program. Implementation of these plans and strategies is not possible without Federal support.

The brief history of the program reflects a careful search for the best procedures and most promising arrangements for bringing the resources of higher education to bear upon the problems of American communities. The particular problems addressed and the progress made toward their solution in numerous projects across the country are matched in importance by the fact that key decision makers in higher education and public life have been afforded an opportunity to explore the most effective ways of establishing

problem-solving partnerships between the towns and cities of America and our colleges and universities. Out of this exploration, models like the following have emerged:

The Neighborhood-Based Community Service Center

Beginning with an experiment in the early days of the program with a "Storefront Education Center" in Buffalo, the concept of establishing a "physical presence" of the institution in the heart of a community has gained wide acceptance. The usefulness of the concept is illustrated by the fact that it has since been replicated with minor modifications in 74 Community Service Centers established and supported by Title I. One hundred institutions of higher education in thirty States have demonstrated the value of this approach to community service and continuing education.

A Consortium of Higher Education Institutions

Cooperative arrangements among institutions of higher education in a given geographical area have proved useful. Four-year and two-year institutions with public and private bases of support have pooled their resources to attack community problems in Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Maryland, New York, and Wisconsin. Individual institutions tend to develop particular academic strengths and community service approaches. A consolidation, therefore, of the specialized teaching and research talents of several institutions aimed at a specific community problem is especially productive because it brings together in one coordinated effort the best contribution that each institution has to offer. The Urban Observatory, discussed earlier in this report, provides one example. It represents a productive relationship between the teaching and research resources of colleges and universities and the efforts of city administrators to improve the quality of local government services.

Student-Faculty Task Forces in Community Service

Many of the successful projects identified to date involve the combined resources of faculty members and students. Experiments in California, New Mexico, and New York have shown that teaching and learning can be enhanced by adding to the processes the dimension of realism that community service and continuing education provide.

Such emerging models need to be tested further, but the achievements thus far and the probability that Title I programs will help to stimulate other promising practices warrant continuing and increased Federal support.

The remainder of this section of Appendix I is devoted to other significant accomplishments of Title I during its four-year history. Particular attention is paid to contributions of the program at institutional, State and community levels.

1. Accomplishments at the Institutional Level

One clear indication of the effectiveness of Title I, HEA is the contribution it has made toward strengthening the community service thrust

of colleges and universities. Since 1966, seven hundred and twenty seven (727) institutions of higher education have participated in the program. The States report that many of these institutions had little or no history of interest and involvement in the community prior to their participation in Title I supported activities, and that as a result of their initiation into the challenge of community service and continuing education have developed a commitment in this area.

A recently concluded survey of State agencies regarding the impact of Title I, HEA upon cooperating institutions of higher education highlights the following achievements:

a. New Structures and Procedures

New or improved institutional arrangements, procedures and techniques have been established in many colleges and universities as a result of Title I efforts. The foregoing models are among the outstanding examples. Specific illustrations include the Urban Education Center in Providence which will be a permanent feature of Rhode Island's efforts to utilize the resources of its public and private colleges in helping to enlarge educational opportunities for blacks and other ethnic minorities, and to assist in improving governmental services in the disadvantaged neighborhoods of the city. In Hawaii, the State University's Institute of Governmental Development, a Title I-initiated experimental program, now operates through funds provided by the State. The Governor of Indiana gave credit to Title I for helping him to establish a Department of Community Affairs which will work with the State's institutions of higher education to meet common objectives. In Washington, D.C. a consortium of six universities is exploring the use of student-faculty task forces to help the District Government in improving its delivery of services to the people of the city.

The University of Oklahoma is continuing its experiments with the urban extension agent concept for disadvantaged neighborhoods in Tulsa in a project called "Professors of the City." The University, in cooperation with several other institutions of higher education, is using its academic expertise to develop seminars and courses, and to provide technical assistance for the improvement of communication, leadership training, youth opportunities, housing, and public health services.

b. Student Services in the Community

Many colleges and universities are giving their students community experience, usually on a volunteer

basis, in Title I programs. One such program is at California State College at Los Angeles, which established an experimental Community Involvement Center to organize and train students for community service. The program has been labeled EPIC (Educational Participation in Communities). Volunteer students worked closely with the disadvantaged in the Watts and East Los Angeles areas, and to date over 1500 students, under volunteer faculty supervision, have been assigned to work with 78 public and private agencies. EPIC has been awarded the Silver Trophy Vision Award by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, and two annual awards were presented by the L.A. County Probation Department. EPIC is now an on-going program of the institution and is funded from other sources. The graduate student internships in Texas' Model Cities Program is another Title I experiment aimed at giving students opportunities for service and learning in their major fields of study.

c. New Courses and Improved Instruction

New courses and improved instruction in undergraduate and graduate curricula are important by-products of the Community Service and Continuing Education Program.

In Massachusetts, for example, the development of a bachelor's and master's degree in Urban Affairs at Boston University was attributed partially to the influence of Title I, HEA. A degree program at Franconia College in New Hampshire for adults interested in community affairs, and discovery of new techniques at Kansas State Teachers College for preparing teachers for deprived neighborhoods were also reported. Other institutions gave Title I, HEA credit for new courses or improved curricula in the areas of law enforcement, architecture, sociology, community development, and other facets of urban studies.

d. New Institutional Commitments

The States reported an increase in the number of institutions, professors, academic disciplines and inter-disciplinary projects in community service and continuing education.

In North Dakota, five institutions participated in the program in the first year. Now all of the State's fourteen colleges and universities are involved

in some aspect of the program. The total number of participating institutions throughout the Nation has increased from 294 in 1966 to 454 in 1969. At the University of Utah each college has designated a staff member to direct continuing education activities. The College of Great Falls, Montana reports that its extension program has "increased ten-fold." Another clear measure of impact on an institution of higher education is the new Urban Development Institute at the University of New Mexico.

e. Inter-Institutional Cooperation

Title I encouraged inter-institutional cooperation on local and statewide levels for community education programs. The resulting patterns and programs have been designed to achieve many and varied functions.

For example, the Higher Education Council on Urban Affairs (HECUA) has drawn together nineteen colleges and universities in the greater Baltimore area. This program is realizing a number of goals: educating the higher education community to specific needs of the poor in the areas of employment, college admissions and community services; stimulating the higher education institutions to respond specifically, effectively, and vigorously to community problems; creating educational programs which focus higher education resources on these problems; and establishing permanent coordination of college and community resources.

Cooperative arrangements have been formalized in Ohio with the creation of the State Council on Higher Continuing Education and in North Dakota where 16 colleges and universities formed a State Extension Council.

2. Accomplishments at the State Level

Title I has contributed significantly to the creation and enhancement of a viable State-Federal partnership aimed at addressing the problems of States, cities and local communities. Government officials, leading citizens, community residents and representatives of higher education have established productive working relationships that have demonstrated the value of State responsibility, planning and coordination, and financial support.

a. Improved State Leadership and Reponsibility

Fifty four (54) State Agencies (in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the

Virgin Islands) have been established. These agencies are charged by each Governor with the task of developing and implementing an effective statewide system of community service and continuing education. As a result of Title I, HEA every State in the Union is now giving explicit attention and leadership to this crucial area. The existence of experienced State agencies is essential for statewide and National planning for community service and continuing education programs.

Advisory Councils in all but three States have given university representatives, State administrators, elected officials, and community residents an opportunity to learn to work together to establish statewide program priorities, approve adequate proposals, and stimulate effective programs of continuing education. The 51 Advisory Councils, involving 709 volunteer citizens, have helped to create a useful model of Federal-State-higher education-citizen cooperation in addressing the contemporary problems of urban and rural America. The Nation now has a reservoir of expertise in State agencies, Advisory Councils, institutions of higher education, and local communities that would not have been developed without this Federal program.

b. Contributions to Statewide Planning and Coordination

In spite of serious financial restraints, statewide coordinated plans for continuing education and community service have been developed in a significant number of States. Georgia, for example, has established a Statewide Network for Coordinated Higher Education Community Service. Thirty colleges and universities have joined together to form this network and to pool their combined resources for more effective response to community educational needs. The statewide network consists of three coordinated components: Small institutions with limited faculty resources which provide physical facilities; Area Community Continuing Education Centers at larger colleges which design and offer programs in their service areas; and statewide program units that tackle problems on a larger scale through utilization of the multidisciplinary resources of the major universities. Similar contributions of Title I are further documented in a recent nationwide study conducted by the Southern Regional Education Board.1/ According to the survey, State governors and presidents of private and public colleges and

1/ Lanier Cox and Lester E. Harrell, The Impact of Federal Programs on State Planning and Coordination of Higher Education (SREB, Atlanta, Ga. 1969).

universities believe that Title I, HEA has made significant contributions to statewide planning and coordination of higher education activities. A majority of college presidents reported that the State Plan provided equitably for the interests of all institutions.

c. Stimulation of State and Local Financial Support

The States have responded well to the challenge of the legislation. During the first four fiscal years States, institutions of higher education, and local communities provided a larger proportion of "matching costs" than that required under the Federal matching formula for participation. From FY 1966 through FY 1969, the States used $37,672,300 in Federal funds, while State and local matching during the same period amounted to $23,711,800, an overmatch of $4,192,000. The overmatching has permitted and encouraged smaller institutions to become involved in statewide activities. In addition, five State legislatures have appropriated earmarked funds for matching purposes for this program, and many other States are considering such support. It must be recognized, however, that the matching requirement has the effect in some cases of eliminating worthy institutions from participation.

3. Accomplishments at the Community Level

More than 2,500 community service and continuing education projects conducted during the past four years by 727 colleges and universities provided educational services designed to assist in the solution of particular aspects of community problems. More than two million adults in over 5,000 neighborhoods and larger communities participated in such educational activities as these intended to improve the leadership skills of disadvantaged minorities, the services of State and local government agencies, the strategies for abating environmental pollution, the ability to deal with rising crime rates and juvenile delinquency, and the capacity of citizens and public officials to work together to improve the quality of life in America's towns and cities.

In keeping with the intent of the law, the majority of communities (approximately 70%) served by this program have been urban and suburban areas, though constructive programs have also been conducted in a number of small towns and rural areas. One recent development in this connection is a plan being developed by the State of Montana to coordinate and consolidate the resources available under Title I, HEA of 1965, with the resources of HUD, OEO, and the Department of Agriculture in an effort to serve the needs of small scattered towns in this sparsely populated State.

The program's contributions to scores of communities were numerous and varied. Specific contributions of Title I, HEA to communities and the community problem-solving process could be listed and supported almost endlessly,[2/] but the foregoing section of this Appendix which details accomplishments during FY 1969 makes it unnecessary to devote more space to the topic at this juncture.

4. Summary

The four year history of the Community Service and Continuing Education Program under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, reflects accomplishments commensurate with, if not surpassing, the modest levels of Federal funding and demonstrates the resourceful leadership of Title I State Administrators. Significant community problems have been attacked, statewide coordinated planning for community service and continuing education has been created and implemented, institutions of higher education have been stimulated to strengthen their community service efforts, and promising models for successful college-community teamwork in problem-solving have emerged.

Much remains to be done, however, if the potential impact of Title I on American communities and institutions of higher education is to be realized. The time has come to eliminate the proliferation of short-term projects and devote substantially increased support to the refinement and application of effective models of higher education in service to the community. The personnel and the machinery are in place; they can move massively and effectively only with a level of financial support that matches the task at hand.

2/ Three previous annual reports have stressed and documented these contributions.

TABLE I

NUMBER AND TYPE OF INSTITUTIONS RECEIVING FEDERAL PROGRAM FUNDS BY FISCAL YEAR

Type of Institution	FY 1966 Number	FY 1966 Percentage	FY 1967 Number	FY 1967 Percentage	FY 1968 Number	FY 1968 Percentage	FY 1969 Number	FY 1969 Percentage
Land Grant and State Univs.	*	—	63	20	85	21	79	22
Four Year Public Insts.	168	56	122	39	138	34	108	31
Four Year Private Insts.	89	29	85	27	120	30	105	30
Two Year Public Insts.	35	12	38	12	53	13	46	14
Two Year Private Insts.	9	3	6	2	8	2	13	3
TOTALS	301	100	314	100	404	100	351	100

* In FY 1966, Land Grant and State Universities were not distinguished from other Four Year Public Institutions.

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL PROGRAM FUNDS BY TYPE OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTION BY FISCAL YEAR

Type of Institution	FY 1966 Federal* Funds	FY 1966 Percentage	FY 1967 Federal Funds	FY 1967 Percentage	FY 1968 Federal Funds	FY 1968 Percentage	FY 1969 Federal Funds	FY 1969 Percentage
Land Grant and State Univs.	___**	___	$4,500.4	51.3	$4,526.6	51.7	$4,226.4	49.7
Four Year Public Insts.	$5,745.3	69	1,693,1	19.3	1,935.8	22.1	1,717.8	20.2
Four Year Private Insts.	2,167.7	26	1,965.1	22.4	1,711.1	19.5	1,777.3	20.9
Two Year Public Insts.	371.2	4	552.7	6.3	538.9	6.1	663.3	7.8
Two Year Private Insts.	68.4	1	61.4	.7	48.4	.6	119.1	1.4
TOTALS	$8,352.6	100	$8,772.7	100	$8,760.8	100	$8,503.9	100

* In Thousands of dollars.
** Not distinguished in FY 1966 from Four Year Public Institutions.

TABLE III

NUMBER OF PROJECTS BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA SERVED

	FY 1966*		FY 1967		FY 1968		FY 1969	
Area Served	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Urban			354	59	378	52	364	56
Urban/Suburban			88	15	95	14	50	7
Rural			50	8	59	8	58	9
Comprehensive			110	18	189	26	181	28
TOTALS			602	100	721	100	653	100

* Not reported by the States in FY 1966.

TABLE IV

DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL FUNDS BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA SERVED

Area Served	FY 1966* Federal Funds	FY 1966* Percentage	FY 1967 Federal** Funds	FY 1967 Percentage	FY 1968 Federal Funds	FY 1968 Percentage	FY 1969 Federal Funds	FY 1969 Percentage
Urban			$ 4.9	56	$ 4.8	54.5	$ 5.1	60
Urban/Suburban			1.1	12	1.1	12.5	.1	6
Rural			.7	8	.7	8.0	.6	7
Comprehensive			2.1	24	2.2	25.0	2.3	27
TOTALS			8.8	100	8.8	100	8.5	100

* Not reported in FY 1966.
** In Millions of dollars.

TABLE V

NUMBER OF PROGRAMS BY PROBLEM AREA

Problem Area	FY 1966	FY 1967	FY 1968	FY 1969
Government	161	159	173	152
Health	36	62	60	45
Employment	54	20	16	22
Youth Opportunities	14	44	43	40
Poverty	85	46	25	33
Recreation	96	36	37	33
Land Use	25	57	43	23
Housing	28	7	5	4
Transportation	10	12	7	2
Personal Development*		26	35	58
Economic Development*		20	17	22
Human Relations*		30	31	42
Community Development*		83	173	177
Other	39			
TOTALS	548	602	721	653

* Categories were introduced in FY 1967.

TABLE VI

DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL AND LOCAL PROGRAM FUNDS BY PROBLEM AREA

Problem Areas	FY 1966 Federal Funds	FY 1966 Local** Funds	FY 1967 Federal Funds	FY 1967 Local Funds	FY 1968 Federal Funds	FY 1968 Local Funds	FY 1969 Federal Funds	FY 1969 Local Funds
Government	$3,114,000		$2,146,756	$ 784,885	$2,462,404	$2,505,534	$1,698,719	$1,356,824
Health	1,071,900		694,407	297,020	516,659	526,982	416,958	379,660
Employment	250,000		309,269	119,606	226,716	303,111	264,367	188,878
Youth Opportunities	436,600		663,913	281,911	483,742	515,879	428,528	383,904
Poverty	1,312,400		819,812	276,051	390,324	409,213	421,510	269,551
Recreation	474,600		420,854	148,999	329,326	353,743	326,045	229,326
Land Use	544,500		848,989	391,192	471,832	523,343	203,328	122,454
Housing	550,000		88,990	47,173	65,381	65,381	13,012	10,092
Transportation	135,800		155,052	55,369	68,655	145,630	4,600	2,800
Personal Development*			324,180	109,217	481,050	515,467	762,299	578,941
Economic Development*			334,819	133,258	221,585	221,645	206,671	180,022
Human Relations*			629,897	247,654	297,281	314,273	694,904	566,445
Community Development*			1,335,758	529,624	2,763,130	2,943,518	3,063,050	2,162,606
Other	462,800							
TOTALS	$8,352,600	3,138,000**	8,772,696	3,421,959	8,778,085	9,343,719	8,503,991	6,431,503

* Categories were introduced in FY 1967.
** No breakdown of local funds is available for FY 1966.

TABLE VII

COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Fiscal Year 1969 State Allotments[1]/

U.S. and Outlying Areas			$ 9,500,000
50 States and the District of Columbia			$ 9,338,934
Alabama	175,958	New Mexico	121,677
Alaska	105,733	New York	493,850
Arizona	134,680	North Carolina	207,608
Arkansas	142,316	North Dakota	113,911
California	506,766	Ohio	324,216
Colorado	142,295	Oklahoma	153,588
Connecticut	162,263	Oregon	142,684
Delaware	111,098	Pennsylvania	350,978
Florida	227,490	Rhode Island	119,427
Georgia	196,164	South Carolina	156,011
Hawaii	115,728	South Dakota	114,690
Idaho	115,079	Tennessee	183,638
Illinois	333,347	Texas	332,502
Indiana	207,111	Utah	121,786
Iowa	159,710	Vermont	108,892
Kansas	149,218	Virginia	196,597
Kentucky	168,818	Washington	165,768
Louisiana	178,251	West Virginia	139,136
Maine	121,158	Wisconsin	190,150
Maryland	178,121	Wyoming	106,901
Massachusetts	216,889	District of Columbia	117,437
Michigan	283,198		
Minnesota	177,277		
Mississippi	150,559		
Missouri	198,738	Outlying Areas:	
Montana	115,187	American Samoa	25,584
Nebraska	131,132	Guam	26,713
Nevada	109,324	Puerto Rico	82,698
New Hampshire	114,625	Virgin Islands	26,071
New Jersey	249,254		

1/ Distribution of funds with a basic amount of $100,000 to the 50 States and D.C., $25,000 to American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and the balance distributed on the basis of the total resident population, July 1, 1966.

APPENDIX II

A REVIEW
OF
FEDERALLY-SUPPORTED EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

APPENDIX II

A Review of Federally - Supported Extension and Continuing Education

The Council reviewed a preliminary study of federal support for continuing education of adults.[1] The recommendations in the Council's report reflect its assessment of available information on the status of extension and continuing education across the spectrum of Federal agencies. Following is a summary of significant findings from the study.

Overview

The source of the present analysis was Federal Education Policies, Programs and Proposals by Charles A. Quattlebaum (Washington: Government Printing Office, (1968). An initial determination and classification of 679 Federal educational programs described in that report indicates that 474 (69.3%) activities were wholly or partially concerned with continuing education for adults.

Educational programs for adults as reported by Federal Agencies for FY 1967, are about evenly divided between external and internal activity. There are 233 internal programs which the Federal Government conducts or arranges for adults who are Federal employees. Twelve cabinet level departments and 23 independent agencies report administrative responsibility for these internal programs.

The findings and supporting data summarized here relate only to the 241 external programs which the Federal Government supports financially or with technical assistance or conducts for adults who are not Federal employees. The term "program" as used in the basic data does not correlate with legislative authority. For example, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, is the basis for some 17 separate "programs."

Administration of external programs is a responsibility of the twelve cabinet level departments and of eighteen independent agencies. More than 70% of the programs are administered by seven Federal agencies. Eighty-five (35.2%) programs are in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare where the majority are concentrated in the Office of Education (30) and the Public Health Service (27).

---

1. J. Eugene Welden and William H. Paradise, Some Dimensions of the Federal Government's Role in Continuing Education for Adults. (unpublished report)

Outside the HEW effort 86 programs (35.6%) are reported by six agencies: the Departments of Labor, Interior, and Commerce, the Atomic Energy Commission, Smithsonian Institution, and the National Foundation of Arts and the Humanities. The remaining 70 programs (29.2%) are distributed through 23 agencies and departments. (See Table I)

Participation of 63 million persons - equivalent to 32% of the total U. S. population (1967) and 50% of the population 18 years and over was reported for Federal continuing education efforts. The range of reported participants includes a spectrum from social workers engaged in classroom instruction to farmers who benefit from the educational activities of farmer cooperatives. There exists real differentiation in terms of degree or intensity of participation. Many persons are engaged in long term academic programs and others participate as film viewers, museum visitors or as recipients of printed information.

Expenditures as reported for 223 (94.6%) external programs amounted to $3.1 billion in Fiscal Year 1967. This included at least $134.7 million of apparent duplicate reporting. For example, eight Federal agencies reported transfers of funds from the Agency of International Development. Expenditures were concentrated in three of the ten categories of purposes -- $2.7 billion (87% of the total) for employment and employability, school systems and education resources, and international understanding and foreign technical assistance. Expenditures for improving employment and employability alone accounted for one-half of the total figure. Educational resources and international programs claimed 22% and 15% of total expenditures respectively. The first priority of Federal funding in FY 1967, as discerned in this analysis, was therefore the improvement of employment and employability. On the other hand reported spending for the improvement of environmental quality and use of natural resources, in FY 1967, ranked lowest among the ten categories - less than .01% of total expenditures.

Reported expenditures are significant to the extent that a government's priorities can be said to be reflected in the pattern of its resource allocations, and to the extent that the Federal Government supports continuing education as one means of reaching national objectives.

Higher Education Programs

Fifty seven of the 241 programs were operated directly by Federal agencies. The majority of the 184 remaining programs (112 or 60.8%) involve higher education institutions. (See Table II)

An examination of these 112 programs reveals that 21 of the 30 Federal Agencies relate to colleges and universities for continuing education purposes. Forty seven (42%) of the 112 programs were administered by the Department of HEW and were directed to eight of the ten purpose categories identified in Tables I and II.

Sixty (54%) of the higher education related programs serve three major purposes: improvement of health services and resources, promotion of international understanding, and development of educational resources.

This preliminary analysis of Federal education programs clearly indicates that institutions of higher education play important roles in the achievement of national purposes.

Conclusions

1. Programs appear to be devised on an ad hoc basis rather than based on a plan within a single agency or across agencies for similar purposes.

2. Available data reveals apparent overlap in purpose, procedures and resources employed in the areas of health resources, employability and education resource development. Further study in depth is required of selected programs to determine degree of overlap and level of effectiveness of such programs.

3. Twenty federal programs of continuing education require the submission of state plans as a basis for financial support. A special study of state-plan programs is indicated to determine where state administration might be consolidated and legislative authority amended.

4. There are indications that internal federal programs may have great impact on institutions of higher education and long range implications for federal policy related to the education of adults. A major study effort should be considered in cooperation with the Civil Service Commission and the Department of Defense for fact finding in this area.

5. Further study is required to focus on the factors of legislative authority, administrative practice, coordination and cooperation as a basis for assessment of both internal and external program effectiveness. Otherwise it is impossible for the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education to carry out its Congressionally-mandated review of the administration and effectiveness of such programs.

TABLE I

NUMBER OF PROGRAMS,
NUMBER OF ADMINISTERING AGENCIES AND EXPENDITURES
BY MAJOR PURPOSE
(FY 1967)

Purpose	No. of Agencies Administering	No. of Programs	Reported Expenditures 1/
Employability	9	38	$1,555,646
Health	3	36	141,055
Public Safety	8	18	10,481
Environment	6	10	3,096
Government Operation	3	9	20,166
Business	6	10	104,247
International	18	40	475,160
Nuclear Energy	2	17	7,141
Schools/Education	8	29	688,581
Cultural Resources	6	31	96,086
Unclassified	2	3	18,301
Total	71 2/	241	$3,119,960 3/

1/ In thousands of dollars.

2/ Total is greater than number of agencies (30) since a single agency administers programs for more than one purpose.

3/ Expenditures not reported for 13 programs.

TABLE II

REPORTED PARTICIPATION
IN HIGHER EDUCATION RELATED PROGRAMS
BY FEDERAL AGENCY AND MAJOR PURPOSE

(FY 1967)

Purpose	Federal Agency	No. of Programs	Participants
Improvement of employment/ employability	Justice	1	20,277
	Labor	2	60,000
	HEW	6	7,323,063
	Veterans Adm.	1	N/R 1/
	OEO	1	23,700
	Sub Total	11	7,427,040
Improvement of Health Services/Resources	HEW	19	47,016
	AEC	1	69
	NASA	1	6
	Sub Total	21	47,091
Enhancement of Public Safety/Protection	HEW	3	477,212
	AEC	2	9
	Sub Total	5	477,221
Improvement of Environmental Quality/ Natural Resource Use	Interior	3	10,500,250 2/
	Agriculture	2	N/R
	HEW	1	N/R
	HUD	2	250 2/
	TVA	1	N/R
	Sub Total	9	10,500,500
Improvement of Governmental Operations/ Services	HEW	1	39,256
	Sub Total	1	39,256
Improvement of Business/Industrial Operations	Interior	1	N/R
	Agriculture	3	3,065,000 2/
	Commerce	1	N/R
	TVA	1	2,200
	Federal Reserve Board	1	N/R
	SBA	1	368,877
	Sub Total	8	3,436,077

Purpose	Federal Agency	No. of Programs	Participants
Promotion of International Understanding/Provision of Foreign Technical Assistance	State	4	17,439
	Defense	1	16,000
	Interior	3	137
	Agriculture	1	4,208
	Commerce	2	298
	Labor	2	860
	HEW	2	1,948
	Transportation	1	298
	NSF	1	N/R
	AEC	1	N/R
	Sub Total	18	41,188
Improvement of Understanding and Utilization of Nuclear Energy	AEC	11	3,388,640
	Sub Total	11	3,388,640
Improvement of Schools/ Development of Educational Resources	HEW	13	142,561
	NSF	1	53,000
	AEC	2	977
	NASA	2	320
	Arts & Humanities	3	287
	Sub Total	21	197,145
Development of General Library and Cultural Resources	HEW	1	205,000
	Smithsonian	1	212,920
	Arts & Humanities Foundation	3	100
	Sub Total	5	418,020
Unclassified	HEW	1	781,600
	Sub Total	1	781,600
Grand Total	21	112	26,753,778

1/ Not reported

2/ Estimated

ERIC Clearinghouse
JUN 15 1972
on Adult Education